

**‘SONGBENDERS OF CIRCULAR CHORUSES’:
DITHYRAMB AND THE ‘DEMISE OF MUSIC’**

John Curtis Franklin

Introduction

‘The ancients believed that dithyramps caused the demise of music (διαφθορὰν μουσικῆς).¹ This at least is the opinion of a scholiast commenting on the Aristophanic ‘songbenders of circular choroses’ (κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἄσματοκάμπτας, *Nub.* 333), whom the poet lists among the quack sophists patronized by the Clouds. ‘Ruin of Music’, although it would make for a less euphonious title, might be a more accurate translation, getting at the moral dimension which dominates in the ancient critics, and especially the poets of Old Comedy, who loved to portray the New Muse as a Little Em’ly led astray, or a debauched working girl blowing pipes at a symposium.²

It should not be surprising if such a bald statement were found to be simplistic. The very idea of this ruin is already one-sided. It is amusing to reflect that Plato’s elaborate theories of musical morality rest on the circular logic that ‘the best music is that which delights the best, and best educated, men’ (*Pl. Leg.* 658e–659a). This was not Plato’s erratic opinion, however, but echoes a reactionary position which was held by some, and perhaps many, in the second half of the fifth century. Thus the *Old Oligarch* attributes the ruin of music to the fact that the *dêmos* was unable to cultivate the art, and so did not recognize its pursuit by those who could as something *kalon*, a ‘noble’ undertaking; again with circular logic the good and beautiful of Athens are summoned as possessing the true standard of excellence.³ Some of the elite did indeed cling stubbornly to Archaic musical norms against the rise of the New Music from the mid-fifth century onwards, as part of a more general antidemocratic reaction.⁴ This mass-elite dichotomy was only partial, however, as we shall see.

But to what degree was the dithyramb itself responsible, or so seen by contemporary observers, for ruining the ‘good old music’? Since less extreme versions of this accusation, with or without the moral judgement, are found both in post-Classical authors as well as modern scholarly literature, it seems worthwhile testing the limits of the scholiast’s claim.⁵ I shall take as my point of departure the same word which drew his attention, ἄσματοκάμπτης. This lets us focus on an important subculture of the larger song-culture: the musicians and poets who produced the songs. Of the Archaic poets whose work we have, some belonged to a class of professionals who performed at festivals throughout Greece; but even here the social and moral outlook is largely in agreement with that of aristocratic society itself, from which they usually came.⁶ But with the increasing prominence of musical *tekhnitai* on the democratic stages of fifth-century Athens, and their gradual evolution of the New Music, a divergent perspective becomes apparent.⁷ To be sure, the fragments of the poets themselves are few and difficult to interpret out of their original contexts, while the majority of more intact sources predictably reveal a conservative point of view, with Plato’s the most distracting voice of all.⁸ And yet Plato himself implies the vigour, and even eloquence, of the ‘demotic’ poets, whom he describes as a sort of steering committee of the democracy, which became ever more enamoured of *tekhnê* for its own sake. Indeed the second element of ‘songbenders’ — *kampê* — is commonly found in fifth-century poetry to describe tonal modulation, the practice of which was central to the New Music, and so also of central concern in

contemporary criticism.⁹ So here technical and sociological issues converge, and a precise understanding of the former may prove important in grappling with the latter. Such a fusion is basic to the theoretical programme laid down for ethnomusicology by Alan Merriam in *The Anthropology of Music* (1964), and should be a constant in studying Greek *mousikê* at all periods. So let us not emulate the elitism of Plato and Aristotle, who considered the technical aspect of Greek music unworthy of serious adult attention. What Winnington-Ingram once called ‘dusty places’ and ‘dry manuals’ have their own light to shed on the socio-political dimensions of the New Music, a subject which has attracted much recent attention.

The changing position of the *aulos* in fifth-century Athens has been of central interest. Wilson (1999) assembled and analyzed a rich array of material bearing on Athenian ambivalence, across mass/elite and Athenian/alien divides, towards the instrument, its music and practitioners. Wallace (2003) and Martin (2003) have independently differentiated between the reactionary material collected by Wilson, which can be located almost entirely in the second half (for Pratinas see below); and an initial ‘*aulos* revolution’ in the earlier part of the century, when the instrument was actively cultivated by the Athenian elite, as known from the evidence of Aristotle and others, as well as contemporary vase paintings.¹⁰ These major advances have yet to be synthesized with recent breakthroughs in our understanding of technical developments in *aulos* music and theory during the same period (which have important implications for the thought of Damon and his school, Philolaus and Plato).¹¹ That cannot be attempted here. In what follows, however, I shall add a further articulation, arguing from historical and technical evidence that, if we wish to refer to an ‘*aulos* revolution’, it should be pushed back well into the sixth century and not localized in post-Kleisthenic Athens — where the phrase has a rather misleading resonance. All of this is of first importance for the dithyramb since the genre was, at least in Classical Athens, normally accompanied by the *aulos*. Understanding the dithyramb’s role in the Demise of Music — i.e. the rise of the New Music — therefore becomes a matter of tracking the genre’s progress, that of the *aulos*, and their intersection.

Heptatony and *Polyphônia*

In commenting on ἄσματοκάμπτης, the *Clouds*’ scholiast implicitly coordinates a specific technical issue, modulation (*kampê*), with a social and moral outcome, and alleges that this was the view both of Aristophanes and ‘the ancients’ generally. The practice of modulation underlies terms like *polyphônos*, *polykhordos*, *panharmonios*, and *polyharmonios*, which are closely connected with the *aulos* in our sources — most famously by Plato, who asserts that ‘the *aulos* is the most polychordal (sc. instrument) of all, and things panharmonic are themselves an imitation of the *aulos*’.¹² For convenience I shall henceforth use only the term *polyphônia* to designate this modulatory auletic style.

Dithyrambic rhythm, dance and diction all receive a share of criticism, especially in post-Classical authors.¹³ But tonal issues are especially prominent in contemporary sources. This chronological disparity is doubtless because the melodies were mostly not transmitted with the texts; later critics who wished to understand earlier complaints were obliged to focus on the lexical material at hand. For the earlier period it is enough to recall the *Chiron* fragment of Pherekrates, with its mentions of *kampai*, pentachords, and dozens of strings and *harmoniai* (PCG 155). Later fifth-century concern with the

dimension of pitch (*harmonikê, melopoia*) is confirmed by a fragment of musical history preserved by pseudo-Plutarch, derived probably from Aristoxenos.¹⁴ Possibly it came from a treatise on *dithyramboi*, the existence of which was enticingly postulated by Wehrli on the basis of Aristoxenos' known *Life of Telestes*.¹⁵ The passage is of interest for its distinction of different grades of *poikilia* or 'complexity'. This word was always mutable, used to describe whatever aspect of his artificiality a poet (or his critic) wished to call attention to, be it diction, metre, melody, or accompaniment. In this light reconsider the well-worn fragment of Pratinas, which attacks the hubris of the aulete (PMG 708); the poet asserts his right, and that of his choros, to be a 'swan leading a woven-winged tune (ποικιλόπτερον μέλος)', whereas the *aulos*, which should be a servant, 'belches the breath of a fancified frog' (φρυγέου ποικίλου).¹⁶ Therefore central to the controversy over the rise of professional auletes and their music was a contest over what aspects of music were acceptable subjects of *poikilia*, musical artifice — a semantic haggling typical of Greek oral poetics already in the Archaic period.¹⁷

Polyphōnia as an objectionable innovation implies an earlier norm which is not *poly-*. *Oligochordia* is occasionally found, with its suggestive political resonance.¹⁸ But the true lexical opponent of *poly-* is *hepta-*, i.e. the seven-stringed lyre which is ubiquitous in the Archaic period, as securely attested by literary and ceramic evidence.¹⁹ The opposition of 'seven' and 'many' was a fundamental issue, if not the only one, in the conflict between lyre and *aulos* as formulated by certain members of the Athenian elite during the period under consideration.²⁰ And here technical considerations provide vital clarification of social process, for while the disjunction of lyre and *aulos* was never absolute — since the instruments regularly played together from very early times²¹ — *heptatonos* (so already in Terp. fr. 4 Gostoli) and *polyphōnia* delimit distinct, but overlapping and variously competing and interacting, phases of Greek musical history. As the practice of *polyphōnia* became ever more elaborate, it exceeded the usual knowledge of the educated, which was grounded in norms established already in the Archaic period. Thus threatened with musical disempowerment, a devaluation of the new trend, closely associated with the *aulos*, and a reactionary exaltation of the old music of the lyre, allowed them to preserve a sense of musical dignity through *laudatio temporis acti*.

Csapo (2004) has explored, in less technical terms, the artificial elaboration of a lost golden age of music, which opponents of the New Music contrasted with the moral *ataxia* of a hedonistic theatrocracy in order to bolster their beleaguered elite identity. One may also note that expressions of pure pleasure over music are not uncommon in poets of the good old school.²² The utopian position might seem especially obvious in Plato's appeal to Egypt, whose antiquity and authority Greek scholars loved to claim, as a musical never-never-land where no innovation was ever permitted in any branch of music (Leg. 656e–657f). The fact remains, however, that the New Music *was* different from the old, and that objections to its practices presuppose well-defined conventions, which were in fact being violated. These 'rules', which might seem technical in our age when being *alyros* is not seen as a stigma, were in Archaic and early Classical Greece not the exclusive preserve of *tekhnitai*, but common knowledge to an entire social class, with the exception of an occasional Themistokles or Kleon.²³ Thus in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (482 ff.) it is stated of the seven-stringed lyre that for 'whoever has learned it with skill and cleverness' (ὅς τις ἄν αὐτὴν / τέχνη καὶ σοφίῃ δεδαημένος), it is

‘easily played with gentle habituation, shunning long-suffering labour’ (ῥεῖα συνηθείησιν ἄθυρομένη μαλακῇσιν, ἐργασίην φεύγουσα δυήπαθον). Chief among these ‘gentle habituations’ was knowledge of the seven strings and the conventions of tuning them (cf. 51–4). It is this ‘art’ which is to be understood behind pseudo-Plutarch’s statement that

In general, the style of kitharoidia practiced by Terpander persisted even unto the time of Phrynis as one which was altogether simple. For in the old days it was not allowed to make kitharoidic compositions like today, nor to transfer the *harmoniai* and the rhythms; for in the *nomoi* they guarded the proper tuning for each . . . And all the ancient poets, though not without experience of all the *harmoniai*, only used some of them. For it was not ignorance that was responsible for such narrow range and few-stringedness, etc. ([Plut.] *De mus.* 1133b + 1137a–b)

Support for this assertion comes from an unexpected quarter. Not some newly discovered Egyptian source that could have come down to Plato from the wanderings of Solon — sadly — but in fact a Middle Assyrian document which attests that the practice of adhering to a single heptatonic/diatonic²⁴ tuning per piece was typical of a Mesopotamian music tradition established as classical by the Old Babylonian period. VAT 10101 is a catalogue text which presents 360 song titles divided into thirty-two genres; of these, only two make use of the seven canonical heptatonic/diatonic tunings (known from a small group of additional musical tablets), one of which is the category of love songs — a very suggestive fact for the Greek situation.²⁵ This principle of one heptatonic/diatonic tuning per piece is also found in Hurrian divine praise hymns with musical notation from Ugarit.²⁶ This corpus, in its adherence to the standard Akkadian terminology, confirms the existence of a Mesopotamian heptatonic *koinê*, well beyond the two rivers, by the Late Bronze Age. A musical correlate of ‘the international style’, this art was pursued in the elite contexts of palace and temple.²⁷

The applicability of this material to the Greek situation requires more argument than it can be given here (I have done so in detail elsewhere).²⁸ It must be noticed, however, because its confirmation of a key technical fact (non-modulation) claimed for the old music by its champions deepens our understanding of the fifth century’s socio-musical struggle. This, from the reactionary point of view, went far beyond questions of simple musical pleasure (as Plato insisted). For by the fifth century the seven-stringedness of the various types of lyre had long been an essential ingredient of aristocratic culture, and brought with it an awesome patrimony which ranged from the exalted tones of an ancient, often religious repertoire, to important sociopolitical functions such as those apparently ‘managed’ by Delphi: musical catharses like those performed by Terpander and Thaletas in Sparta, or even city foundation rituals employing the order of lyre strings to govern urban layout.²⁹

The early non-heptatonic structures found in Aristides Quintilianus and pseudo-Plutarch, and which derive from fifth and fourth-century sources documenting both contemporary affairs and more archaic tradition, have often been characterized by modern scholars as ‘disorderly’ or ‘defective’. Such labels assume a heptatonic norm which would not (so the argument goes) be achieved until the time of Aristoxenos. This

evolutionary model, asserted by Winnington-Ingram (1936), is assumed in the many recent technical manuals on which the brilliant new Greek musical scholarship has relied. It is belied by the Mesopotamian and Hurrian material, and I have argued against it elsewhere. In fact these structures are predominantly connected with the *aulos* and the history of its music. This begins from Olympos, a rough and putative contemporary of Terpander, whom Aristoxenos, following a living musicians' tradition, credited with inventing a proto-enharmonic *tropos* and thus 'becoming the founder of the Greek and noble style of music'.³⁰ That these arts had distinct *prôtos heuretês* traditions strongly encourages us to see the musical histories of the two instruments, along with their styles and repertoires, as at least partially independent *post memoriam hominum*. From the 'very beginning', then, there existed a tonal alternative to the heptatony of the lyre tradition.

And yet, as stated above, the instruments were able to perform together when desired or required, as was common throughout the Archaic period. This presupposes shared tonal resources, and there is good reason to believe that, in the conceptualization of these, stringed instruments had occupied a privileged position from very ancient times. Archaic lyre terminology provided the terminological and conceptual 'first principles' for the mature Hellenistic musical system, even as the Perfect System and the Aristoxenian pitch keys (*tonoi*) were elaborated to accommodate the complex *aulos*-driven tonal phenomena.³¹ This accords perfectly with the situation in the Near East, where the heptatonic/diatonic tuning system was also presented in terms of strings, a formulation going back ultimately to Sumerian tradition. It is important, then, that the musicians' tradition cited by Aristoxenos considered Olympos' invention of the 'noble and Greek' enharmonic as later than, *and derived from*, diatonic practice (which Aristoxenos presents elsewhere as the oldest of the three *gene*).³²

The issue of heptatony versus *polychordia* is not limited to the dithyramb, but relates to Greek music generally. Yet because the dithyramb grew up within the larger Hellenic song culture, it is important to establish this common background. For the dithyramb stands accused of ruining not just itself, but Music as a whole.

Arion: 'Kitharoidic' Dithyramb

With this we can turn to the early dithyramps of Arion at Korinth.³³ I submit that these largely conformed to the tonal conventions of Archaic kitharoidia, even if from earliest times the *aulos* too is likely to have accompanied such dances. That is, in terms of its tonal raw material, the dithyramb belonged to the mainstream of Greek music, with its solid 'lyric' basis.³⁴ There is some circumstantial support for this. First and most obvious is that Arion was famous as a kitharoide, not an aulete. For what it is worth, he is called by Fronto *cithara et dithyrambo primus* (*Epist.* 241.1 Van Den Hout). His description by Strabo as a follower of Terpander in the Lesbian school, and a purveyor of 'the same music' (τῆς αὐτῆς μουσικῆς, 13.2.4), probably goes back to Hellanikos' work on the Karneian victors, and so quite probably to contemporary epigraphic evidence from Sparta.³⁵ Note that the combination of kitharoidia with narrative content accompanied by dance is already attested in the Demodokos songs of *Odyssey* 8;³⁶ the 'epico-lyric' poems of Stesichoros are probably also relevant.³⁷ Our first witness of 'dithyramb', Archilochus, was after all a lyrist; and his ability 'to lead off' (ἐξάρξαι, fr. 120 W) such songs may well evoke the kitharoidic leader of a choros.³⁸ There is besides the tradition that the *lyrikos* Ibykos composed dithyramps.³⁹

Now, in the *Hymn to Delos*, Callimachus, in alluding to the theoric missions from Athens, describes how ‘with the rousing of *kithara* music they danced the circular dance, and Theseus led the choros’.⁴⁰ The seemingly eccentric mention of the *kithara* here was regarded by Pickard-Cambridge as reflecting later practice and the well-attested cross-contamination of dithyramb with the (so-called) kitharoidic *nomos*.⁴¹ But the invocation of Theseus, and thereby the poet’s assertion of a dithyrambic *kithara* proper to very ancient practice, might just as well reflect antiquarian research, or even the persistence in some venues of a *palaios tropos* — and where better for that than Delphi or Delos? On Delos one must address the choral interventions of imperial Athens, whereby a renovated Theseus offered ideological support for the new thalassocracy.⁴² Yet how these circular choroses were grafted onto the existing festival is uncertain, and the early example of Bacchylides 17, classified as a dithyramb yet concluding with a paeanic invocation of Apollo, is most suggestive. Delphi was preeminently kitharoidic; its semi-concocted victor list (somehow redacted by Callisthenes and Aristotle) probably went back beyond Terpander’s four octennial entries to a mythological debut⁴³ Only at the festival’s reorganization after the First Sacred War were aulodic and auletic contests added, probably in 582/1 BC, and so in the lifetime of Arion; yet the festival remained preeminently a kitharoidic event.⁴⁴ One should recall here Webster’s argument that the Mnesiepes inscription, dealing with the life of Archilochus, may suggest Delphi’s promotion of dithyramb already in the seventh century.⁴⁵ If this line of thinking is correct, we would need to rethink epigraphic evidence from the Hellenistic period for kitharoides winning dithyrambic choral contests, as well as the fifth-century vases of lyre-playing satyrs, apparently in dithyrambic contexts.⁴⁶

An originally kitharoidic dithyramb — and again, I am not insisting on an exclusively kitharoidic genre, merely one which, without excluding the *aulos*, conformed to the musical norms of the period, which were grounded in the lyre — would also illuminate a curious notice in the *Suda* (s.v. Ἀμφιανακτίζειν): ‘They used to call the dithyrambic poets *amphianaktes* too [i.e. in addition to the kitharoides], because they continually used this expression’. Elsewhere the practice of invoking Anax Apollo is associated by the lexicographers with the kitharoidic prelude and Terpander. But here we are told that dithyrambic poets were *also* called *Amphianaktes*, because they constantly used the same invocation. This report is seconded by a scholiast to *Clouds* who, commenting on the invocation of Apollo in the epicletic hymn of the play’s parabasis (ἀμφὶ μοι αὐτε, Φοῖβ’ ἄναξ), states that ‘he is imitating the preludes of the dithyrambic poets and kitharoides’.⁴⁷

That the two genres of dithyramb and kitharoidia shared a structural feature in their preludes is confirmed by the evidence for *anabolê*, the improvisatory opening movement long associated with kitharoidia (beginning with Homer), but apparently an equal feature of the dithyramb for much its history.⁴⁸ As Comotti pointed out, music which is both sung *and* impromptu only makes sense for kitharoidic practice, since a ‘composer’ playing the *aulos* cannot simultaneously sing.⁴⁹ I would add that an obligatory invocation of Apollo should also point first to lyre music. All of this would contribute to an explanation of the dithyramb’s occasional intersection with the realm of Apollo, for instance the patronage of *kykliai choroi* at Delphi and the Athenian Thargelia, (explicit) dithyrambs at the Karneia at Kyrene, and so on.⁵⁰ More generally appropriate to Apollo is the role of dithyramb, and the Archaic choral traditions generally, in establishing and

maintaining social and political order.⁵¹ Here too we enter into the domain of Archaic kitharoidia, as typified by the Delphic/Spartan tales of Terpander (see above).

Early *polyphônia* and the Argive efflorescence

It would therefore seem that an early ‘kitharoidic’ phase of the dithyramb has been obscured by the state of our evidence, which focuses on the undoubted prominence of the polyphonic *aulos* in the genre’s fifth-century form in Athens. These two phases may be bridged by a period of concentrated innovation in the later sixth century, most readily located in the Argolid. Barbara Kowalzig has discussed the social upheavals which characterize this place and time, and the rich evidence that choral music, and in particular the dithyramb, was a vital medium for public self-reflection in a changing world; as she notes, it is no coincidence that this period was also characterized by musical innovation.⁵² A surprising number of quasi-technical details relating to this ‘movement’ have survived. A well-known but still obscure passage of pseudo-Plutarch seems to connect the dithyramb with *polyphônia* in a description of the activities of Lasos of Hermione (c.548–after 509 BC), who ‘changing the rhythms of the dithyrambic movement (*agôgê*), and cultivating the *polyphônia* of the *auloi*, using more and scattered notes, induced a transformation of music as it had previously been’.⁵³ What exactly is meant by ‘more and scattered notes’ has been a perennial stumper. But there is an implicit contrast which is clear enough: ‘many notes’ as an innovation contrasts most clearly with the seven-stringed lyre as a point of departure. In some sources Lasos stands after Arion as the second principal articulation of dithyrambic history.⁵⁴ D’Angour’s (1997) hypothesis that Lasos reformed the shape and movement (its *agôgê*) of an earlier dithyrambic dance to resolve the choral diction problem of the ‘prodigal san’ is very attractive: the circling of a square choros may have been vital in Athens where fifty performers were to sing at a time.⁵⁵ The same problem of scale could also help account for the increased importance of the *aulos*, since the instrument, by all ancient accounts, would have provided a more audible accompaniment for so many voices. These innovations, if such they were, would probably be the most important *formal* contribution of Lasos to the genre. But as the following discussion will establish, Lasos himself certainly did not invent *polyphônia*, nor was the practice original or unique to the dithyramb.

According to Herakleides of Pontos, drawing on an inscription at Sikyon which used the sequence of Argive priestesses as a chronological framework for a sort of musical history or annotated victor list, the aulete Klonas of Tegea (or Thebes) composed something called *Trimelês Nomos*. This ‘Piece in Three Tunings’ was also attributed to the (supposedly) somewhat younger Sakadas of Argos, who is securely dated to the early sixth century by his three inscribed victories in the reorganized Pythian games.⁵⁶ We are told that these aulete-composers effected modulations between successive strophes of the piece. One suspects that the sequential arrangement of Dorian, Phrygian and Lydian may be anachronistic, given that this conforms to the later ordering of the canonical *tonoi* (though this is a potentially circularity argument). Yet we need not dismiss the basic modulatory explanation of *trimelês* as mere guesswork by Herakleides. Such a tradition could easily have been handed down among professionals like Pindar, who is known to have written a *prooimion* about Sakadas, and often reflected on various aspects of musical history, including that of both *aulos* and dithyramb.⁵⁷ Indeed, if it is right that the *Sikyonische Anagraphe* was not composed until the later fifth century, a musicians’ oral

tradition was surely the source of information for Sakadas' professional activity; and the existence of the Klonas variant suggests the same.⁵⁸ It is of first importance that the *Trimelês Nomos* was attributed to auletes, a vital point if non-modulating music was historically proper to the heptatonic lyre. Moreover, it is noteworthy that its genre is unspecified; this and the dual attribution to Sakadas and Klonas suggest that an elaborate new form of *aulos* music was being developed *generally* for choral performances, with the Peloponnese a scene of concentrated activity. It is a reasonable guess that the movement had gathered enough momentum by the time of Sakadas that the Delphic reorganizers felt justified (pressured?) in adding the new events to what had always been a kitharoides' festival.

All of this should be understood behind the statement of Herodotus that, during the reign of Polykrates (c.540–22 BC), 'the Argives were held to be first among the Hellenes in music'. Sakadas seems to have made an early contribution to this efflorescence by founding a new festival at Argos (the obscure Endymatia), as well as helping promote activity in Sparta and Arcadia.⁵⁹ The Argolid must therefore have been an important *locus geniorum* in the further development of polyphonic *aulos* music (probably effected at first by using several separate instruments). This may also have been where and when the first Greek musical notation developed, as suggested by archaic local letter-forms in the original core of the system.⁶⁰ Because these occur in the instrumental notation, more ancient than the vocal, one suspects that the invention was inspired by the needs of professional auletes transgressing the familiar limits of the seven-stringed lyre. Consider in this light Aristoxenos' dismissal of unnamed predecessors (and note his criticism of Lasos, *Harm.* 3) for whom the goals of *harmonikê* were musical notation and the understanding of *aulos* melodies (*Harm.* 39). His own theoretical program for *harmonikê* involved taking diatonic-heptatony as its first principle (*arkhê*), thereby defending the privileged, 'Arcadian' position of the Archaic lyre.⁶¹ Note finally that the mechanical devices used by later *virtuosi* like Pronomos of Thebes (c.470–390) must merely have allowed greater convenience and more precise control in an art which had long been growing more elaborate; and even so the instrument's difficulties of intonation were still very real in Aristoxenos' day.⁶²

One might well extend Herodotus' statement about Argos geographically to include contemporary musical and poetic activities at Sikyon, about which we are relatively well informed.⁶³ The hostilities between Argos and Sikyon under Kleisthenes (c.600–570 BC) might rather suggest a cultural disjunction, but it is noteworthy that the tyrant's animosity found specifically musical expression, both in his ban of rhapsodic performances (which glorified Argos) and the speciously pious machinations by which he stripped the local Adrastos-cult of the 'tragic choroses' which celebrated the hero's *pathea*.⁶⁴ Evidently these musical measures were a conspicuous means of severing relations, and an effective way to reinforce a tribal reorganization designed to segregate Sikyonians and Argives (it is most important that Herodotus immediately proceeds to state that the tyrant's actions inspired his grandson Kleisthenes' restructuring of the Athenian tribes). Yet such anti-Argive policies last forever. In the following decades the Sikyonian aulete Pythokritos reigned supreme at Delphi, following Sakadas with six consecutive victories (570–50 BC: Paus. 6.14.9–10). Perhaps the *Sikyonische Anagraphe*'s use of the Argive priestess sequence should be referred to such a period of shared musical activity.⁶⁵ It is also worth recalling given the arguments to come that

Lysander of Sikyon was said by Philochoros, among other mysterious musical activities, to have ‘swapped his instrument’ (ὄργανον μετέλαβεν) and (not necessarily connected) cultivated ‘aulos-style *kithara*-playing’ (ἔναυλος κιθάρισις); in this he was followed by (or followed) the school of Epigonos, an honorary Sikyonian.⁶⁶

This was the larger musical environment in which Lasos would have received his early training. His ‘more and scattered notes’ were therefore not his own invention but represented the mature growth of a style whose seeds were planted in the early sixth century at the latest. Nor had *polyphōnia* been cultivated exclusively in the dithyramb. This early Peloponnesian *polyphōnia* should also be understood behind the aristocratic cultivation of the *aulos* in Athens during the first decades after the Persian Wars, when all sorts of enthusiasms were indulged (according to the passage of Aristotle cited above). This may come as a surprise, since it is widely assumed that one of the objectionable features of the New Music was precisely its use of ‘many notes’, i.e. modulation.⁶⁷ Besides Lasos there is good evidence to connect Simonides with *polyphōnia*.⁶⁸ As for Pindar, the poet thrice describes the *aulos* as *pamphōnos*, and while this word is more suggestive of the instrument’s versatility and intensity generally, from this broader notion *polyphōnia* should not be excluded.⁶⁹ Pindar’s much-flaunted *poikilia* also seems a rather general term for musical complication, but the word was understood at least by pseudo-Plutarch as entailing *polychordia*.⁷⁰ That *polyphōnia* was already standard practice for these poets who were later seen as proponents of an ‘austere style’ and the ‘good old school’,⁷¹ derives considerable confirmation from the fact that the theory of Aristoxenos, a notorious musical conservative, nonetheless presented a procedure for modulation discussed by his undatable predecessor Eratokles, and which is reflected in Ion of Chios; this was a ‘classical’ technique.⁷² But how then can one account for the known reaction against the modulations of the New Musicians? Clearly they must have used modulation to excess, or ones which were improperly constituted, violating this earlier ‘Eratoklean’ convention. In fact, Aristoxenos knew other forms of modulation, although how systematically he treated these, and what his attitude was about them, is unclear.⁷³

The aulos and melodic ‘bends’

We can now return to ἄσματοκάμπτης. The musical developments outlined above seem to find a lexical counterpart in the semantic field of *kampê* (‘bend’). *Kampê* was not the only metaphor for modulation in the fifth century. But because it is so well attested in contemporary sources, it approaches the status of a *terminus technicus*. Used by both proponents and critics, *kampê* was clearly current among practicing musicians, and one suspects that reactionaries were contesting the mismanagement of an established practice.⁷⁴ *Kampê* thus functions particularly well both as ‘a marker as well as a carrier’ of musical change. Moreover, as I shall argue, it has a deep historical involvement with choral poetics, which makes it an especially useful diagnostic tool for the dithyramb.

The many musical occurrences of *kampê* and its relations (used by or of Phrynīs, Aristophanes, Eupolis, Agathon, Pherekrates, Kinesias, Timotheos and Telestes) have been collected by Restani and need not be reviewed completely.⁷⁵ But an important point has been overlooked, requiring a reexamination of several passages which are by now rather familiar (and some which are less so).

Another scholion which glosses the Aristophanic ‘songbenders’ offers the explanation that the dithyrambic poets were so-called ‘through their pieces not staying in

a tuning (or ‘the enharmonic’) . . . they have many *kampai*, which musicians call strophes, antistrophes, and epodes’.⁷⁶ This statement is uniquely valuable for preserving this musicians’ use of *kampê* to designate the principal articulations of strophic composition; no doubt *kampê* was originally a term of choreography — like *strophê* itself, as Hellenistic scholars claimed.⁷⁷ Clearly related is the word’s use as a technical rhetorical term for the ‘rounding off’ or ‘bending back’ of a period, attested unambiguously by Demetrios and Cicero, and going back to the Classical period as shown by a passage of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*.⁷⁸ Here the well-turned or periodic *lexis* is contrasted with the paratactic run-on style; Aristotle likens the former to the ‘antistrophes of the ancient poets’, and the latter to the rambling dithyrambic *anabolai* with which Melanippides replaced his antistrophes in the dithyramb (1409a24–34, 1409b25 f.). The astrophic *anabolê* is like a walker who, ‘exceeding the turning point’ (ἀποκάμπτοντες τοῦ τέρματος), leaves his companions behind. This image gets its point from *kampê* (or *kamptêr*) as the turning point and/or finish line in the *diaulos* or double course track, which indeed Aristotle goes on to adduce as an analogy (ἐπὶ τοῖς καμπτήρσιν, 1409a31 f.).⁷⁹ Without the scholiast’s testimony that the metaphor was also used of strophic form, one might not make this connection in the Aristotelian passage; but given that the second point of the philosopher’s comparison involves the new dithyrambic *anabolai*, which were distinguished precisely for being astrophic, there can be no doubt that Aristotle assumes what the scholiast also knew.

How much older than Aristotle was this application of *kampê* to strophic form? It is surely easier to believe that *kampê* developed as choral metaphor before its rhetorical usage, since choral lyric reached a much earlier acme than Attic prose (not to mention rhetoric per se) and in the fifth century still enjoyed high cultural prestige.⁸⁰ Take as a parallel the word *strophê* itself, which clearly underlies Aristotle’s term for periodic style (λέξις κατεστραμμένη). For as if the linguistic kinship were not obvious enough, the philosopher brings the two together in his definition: “‘turned back’ and similar to the antistrophes of the ancient poets’ (κατεστραμμένην καὶ ὁμοίαν ταῖς τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν ἀντιστρόφοις, *Rhet.* 1409a25 f.), where the conventions of Archaic choral language are invoked as a basic and widely understood frame of reference for the more specialized and younger rhetorical term. It is true that *strophê* itself is not attested in its musical sense before Aristophanes and Pherekrates (see below); but those passages clearly suppose an established usage, and of course what we call ‘strophic form’ is found already in early lyric. It seems quite reasonable to suppose that such a standard choral term as *strophê* would have been well established already during the Archaic period, when choral poetry was flourishing. I would suggest that the same was true of *kampê*, so similar in sense to *strophê*, and that Aeschylus and Euripides were well aware of the choral usage; as composers of choral lyric themselves they would be ready and willing to make artistic use of such language.

I have taken pains to establish the plausibility of this scenario, and to argue for the antiquity of *kampê* as a choral term, because I wish now to suggest that the two uses of the word considered above — a structural boundary in strophic composition, and melodic modulation — may be neatly coordinated by supposing that the practice attributed to Klonas and Sakadas (melodic modulation *at* strophic boundaries) had become standard by the end of the Archaic period as part of the *polyphōnia* movement. A specialized

melodic meaning of *kampê* would readily develop from the word's more basic formal sense if the melodic practice it describes became an expected (or not unexpected) feature of strophic and epodic transitions. Since strophes were apt to be quite long in the time of Lasos, Simonides and Pindar, modulation may have been introduced for periodic contrast, as it were. If limited to major structural articulations *à la* Klonas/Sakadas, the musical and 'ethical' identity of each *harmonia* would be preserved — and hence the ancient principle of non-combination — without drawing the fire of an early Plato.⁸¹ This would accord with the report that Sakadas honoured the 'noble style' of Terpander. Lasos too, though associated with *polyphônia*, is never attacked for it. The same may be said of Simonides and Pindar (see above).

The best test of this hypothesis is to see if it can enrich our understanding of the contemporary poetic material. Consider first a fragment of Pindar, attributed by Plutarch to one of the poet's hyporchemes, which seems to confirm *kampê* as an early choral term: 'Be like a Pelasgian horse or Amyklaian dog: shake (*elelizomenos*) a competitive foot and pursue a bending melody (*kampylon melos*: Pi. fr. 107a1–3)'.⁸² The language is remarkably dense and multivalent. In the context of racing or hunting, *kampylon melos* both suggests the 'bent leg' of a running animal, and evokes *kampê* or *kamptêr* in the concrete sense of a racing goal. But we are encouraged to understand it equally as a 'bending melody' by other musically relevant details: twice elsewhere Pindar uses ἐλελίζειν ('whirl, shake') of playing the lyre (Pind. *Ol.* 9.13; *Pyth.* 1.4), while it is clear from the sequel that 'foot' here also has a metrical, choreographic sense. Probably then the phrase ἄγωνίῳ / ἐλελίζόμενος ποδὶ is an apt description of the poet or choristers in competitive performance. It is tempting to suppose that the passage occurred just before a strophic boundary, and announced both a metrical turning point and melodic change; it is noteworthy that Plutarch considered this passage an exceptionally programmatic alliance of dance and poetry.

Moving on to *kampai* as practiced by the New Musicians, it will be useful to take first a fragment of the relatively late Telestes for its potential illumination of the foregoing Pindaric passage. In describing a performance on the *magadis* (a polychordal harp like those decried by Plato), Telestes seems to flaunt his modulatory style with the expression 'swiftly turning back around (*anastrôphôn*) the boundary-bending (*kampsidiaulon*) hand'.⁸³ With *kampsidiaulon* we are again in a racing context; possibly it also suggests the double-*aulos* which was responsible for the new modulatory style. *Anastrôphôn* surely evokes strophic form, the conventions of which are thus taken here at a gallop. While Pindar's imagery is rather more convoluted, both poets seem to be drawing on a metaphor commonly used of choral movement. And in both passages *kampê* is extended to the accompanying music.

Reconsider now Music's complaint against Kinesias in the much-discussed fragment of Pherekrates' *Chiron*.⁸⁴ The sexual allegory and hetairization of Music here have been well exposed by Dobrov/Urios-Aparisi (1995) and need not be rehearsed here. The dithyramb is explicitly cited in this part of the critique, although the *pyrrhichê* may well be implicated by the much-debated reference to shields, if indeed Kinesias composed a controversial shield-dance.⁸⁵ Now, how can one understand the 'exharmonic bends' (ἐξαρμόνιοι καμπαί), with which Kinesias is taxed, as something different than the modulatory practice of the good old school? The interpretation 'bends/modulations away from the *harmonia*' has insufficient force, since modulation is by definition such a

movement. The sense must be closer to ‘bends/modulations which are alien to *harmonia*’ — i.e. melodic/musical movement in which there is not even an identifiable *harmonia* from which one is departing, and all point of ‘harmonic’ reference is lost. Other readings are possible, but should move in this direction. The occurrence of bends ‘in his strophes’ (ἐν ταῖς στροφαῖς) is especially suggestive; whatever its exact meaning, it brings *kampai* into direct connection with strophic form. Can this not be read as bends ‘within his strophes’, that is, not at the strophic boundary? Such a practice would yield *kampai* (modulations) within *kampai* (strophes, antistrophes, epodes). This semantic bifurcation, ‘bends within bends’, might well have suggested the famous images applied to the New Music’s convolutions — the ant-paths of Agathon and Timotheos, or the wriggling caterpillars mentioned in verses which are generally thought to belong to this same fragment of Pherekrates.⁸⁶

In the same fragment Music also charges that Phrynīs ‘inserted his own kind of rotisserie (στροβίλον), and so ruined (διέφθορεν) her with his bending and turning (κάμπτων με καὶ στρέφων, 14 f.). As with Telestes, strophic convention is evoked by στρέφων and the mysterious στροβίλον (contributing equally to the conceit of a sexual ruin). Also here is contemporary confirmation of the Aristophanic scholiast’s charge, that technical changes per se could be seen by some (if not the poet himself) as responsible for, or at least closely associated with, moral decay.

Two passages of Aristophanes are also relevant. In the *Thesmophoriazusae*, Agathon’s slave relates that the poet ‘bends (κάμπτει, 55) new molds of words . . . but being winter it is not easy to bend the strophes back around’ (κατακάμπτειν τὰς στροφὰς οὐ ῥάδιον, 67 f.). Here the gag seems to be that Agathon, one of the effeminate moderns, is physically unable to make a *kampê* coincide with strophe end — where it should be. With the mention of *epê* (poetic words or phrases) the verbal dimension is clearly foremost, and failure to achieve proper *kampai* must allude to astrophic composition. But melodic modulation may be equally implicated: where there were no *kampai* (strophes, antistrophes or epodes), the familiar formal constraint on modulation was also removed.

Finally, in *Clouds*, Dikaios Logos asserts that boys in the good old days were not allowed to ‘bend some bend (κάμψειέν τινα καμπήν) / Like they do nowadays, the ones in the style of Phrynīs, these ones which are so difficult to bend’ (τὰς δυσκολοκάμπτους, 969 f.). The threefold repetition of *kamp-* suggests both the frequency with which Phrynīs used such bends, and spluttering outrage at the practice. But the qualifying relative (οἷας οἱ νῦν, bends ‘like they do now’) may also imply *kampai* of a different kind which Dikaios Logos learned to sing in his own youth, so much easier than the difficult bends of Phrynīs’ day — themselves perhaps old-hat when *Clouds* was first staged.⁸⁷

The whole situation is suggestive of the contamination of lyre music by new auletic techniques, to which Plato alludes (see above). On the one hand the imagined scene takes place at the ‘house of the *kithara*-teacher’ (964); the negative role model Phrynīs was himself a *kitharoide*; and the phrase ‘tuning the *harmonia* which our fathers handed down’ (ἐντειναμένους τὴν ἁρμονίαν ἣν οἱ πατέρες παρέδωκαν, 968) uses language fundamentally suited to chordophones. On the other hand, in the first half of the fifth century the *aulos* was commonly taught in the music lesson; Phrynīs is said to have

started out as an aulete before switching to the *kithara*; and the invocation of a kitharoidic patrimony best emphasizes the outrage if an opposing force is assumed.⁸⁸ Finally, note that the description of boys having ‘to walk in the streets in an orderly fashion’ (βαδίζειν ἐν ταῖσιν ὁδοῖς εὐτάκτως) on their way to the *kithara*-teacher contains musical puns relating to the difference between the old and new music: the melodic road (*hodos*), with modulation seen as an intersection, is the very metaphor which Aristoxenos connects with his predecessor Eratokles, while *taxis* is often used of the tuning of one or many strings; the whole complex is already found in Ion of Chios fr. 32 (West), i.e. contemporary with or earlier than Aristophanes.⁸⁹

The foregoing passages are thus quite attractively read as implying two strata of meaning and practice for the term *kampê* in its application to modulation, corresponding to the earlier and later phases of the ‘*aulos* revolution’ (Lasos, Simonides, Pindar *et alii* versus the New Music respectively). They support the thesis that the innovation attributed to Klonas and Sakadas in the historiographical tradition was not some one-off experiment, but became common and acceptable usage in choral poetry by the end of the Archaic period, and continued to be elaborated thereafter.

Dithyramb and the ‘aulos revolution’

Let us see what light all of this throws on the dithyrambic Demise of Music. I have argued that the ‘Arionic’ dithyramb represents an early phase of Greek musical history when tonal resources were largely determined by the heptatonic/diatonic ‘laws’ of the *kithara*, while the polyphonic ‘*aulos* revolution’ began gathering steam only in the early sixth century. The intersection of this movement with dithyramb is apparently traced back to Lasos of Hermione by pseudo-Plutarch and/or his source, although I have shown that *polyphônia* was in no way original to Lasos or the dithyramb. Similarly Pindar’s *pamphônos*, and the various occurrences of *poikilia* and its relations, occur in the poet’s epinicians, not the dithyrambic fragments. Nor can the evidence for the *polychordia* of Simonides be tied clearly to the dithyramb; and though his dithyrambic output was probably prodigious, he composed in many other genres.

Turning to the representatives and critics of the New Music, accusations and celebrations of frequent *kampai* and equivalent expressions are not limited to the dithyramb, but are found equally of kitharoides, who predominate in the fragment of Pherekrates. In fact, most of the New Musicians are attested as having written in a variety of genres (and the exceptions of Kinesias and Telestes may only be apparent).⁹⁰ This surely contributed much to the blurring of generic distinctions which Plato lamented. As suggested above, the invention of astrophic form by Melanippides and/or his contemporaries must have revolutionized modulatory practice, giving free reign to *kampai* (modulations) by removing their historical boundaries (*kampai*, strophic limits). But while Aristotle connects the astrophic form with Melanippides and the dithyramb (compare *Rhet.* 1409a25 with 1409b26), Pherekrates seems to critique him as a kitharoides; while Kinesias, whom Pherekrates criticizes for his dithyrambs, is described as practicing *kampai* within the strophic, not astrophic, form. Aristophanes, too, exposes *kampai* in the kitharoidia of Phrynīs and the tragedies of Agathon and Euripides; and his repeated digs at Kinesias are clearly as much *ad hominem* as *ad genus*.

If anything, there is some reason to suppose that the various solo forms subsumed under the heading of *nomos* would have played a more important role than the dithyramb

in the initial fostering of technical developments. This would make sense of Plato's portrait of poets devising musical changes in consultation with *each other*, and then presenting them to the *dêmos* (see below). It is also suggested by a well-known Aristotelian *problêma*, according to which the kitharoidic *nomoi* could become astrophic because it was easier for a professional soloist to execute various mimetic effects, including modulations ([Arist.] *Pr.* 19.15):

Why is it that *nomoi* were not composed in antistrophes, but other songs — those for the choros — were? Is it because *nomoi* were the pieces of professionals, and since they were already capable of mimesis and adaptation, their song became long and multiform? And just as with the diction, the melodies too followed the mimesis, always becoming different. For it is more necessary that melodies be mimetic than words. Which is also why the dithyrambs too, after they became mimetic, no longer had antistrophes, although they had once had them. And the reason is the fact that in antiquity it was the free citizens themselves who were in the choroses; and so it was hard for many to sing in the professional style, so that they used to sing melodies in a single *harmonia*.⁹¹ For it is easier for one person to make many modulations than for many, and for a professional rather than those who are safeguarding the character (sc. of the composition). Wherefore they used to compose simpler melodies for them. And the antistrophic form is a simple thing, since it has number and is measured by a single unit. And it is for this same reason that pieces sung from the stage (i.e. those of actors) are not antistrophic, but those of the choros are; for an actor is a professional and mimetic, but a choros is less so.

According to the view of poetic history espoused here, after the dithyramb became mimetic, it too abandoned strophic form; and by the most natural reading, this took place later than in the kitharoidic *nomos*. If that is correct, it need not contradict Aristotle's statement that the astrophic form was developed by Melanippides in the dithyramb; by harmonizing this report with the evidence of Pherekrates, we could suppose that Melanippides imported into the dithyramb a sort of astrophic music already cultivated in his kitharoidic poetry. There are, however, two implications in this *problêma* which should not pass unchallenged. First, that when it *was* still strophic and danced by choroses, the dithyramb never used 'many modulations' (πολλὰς μεταβολάς); for this seems definitely refuted by what Pherekrates says of Kinesias (see above), who probably was popular as he claims, despite what our sources say, and is known to have been active as a choros-trainer.⁹² Second, that after the dithyramb became astrophic, it was no longer performed by choroses; but on that question I have found no evidence. Thus, the *problêma* is silent just where we would like more information, on the stages by which *nomos* and dithyramb converged. But this vagueness is itself a valuable fact: that the process could not be unravelled already in the fourth century shows just how tangled the various musical forms had become. As noted above, cross-pollination was a simple matter when composers wrote in many genres. Indeed, if my view of the 'Arionic' dithyramb is correct, the idea of generic convergence may always have been somewhat less clear-cut than Plato would suggest, perhaps especially for dithyramb and the kitharoidic *nomos*.

It is noteworthy that Plato, despite the usual jibes about Kinesias and dithyrambic diction, does not single out the genre for special blame. In the *Apology* (21e-22c), Sokrates relates how he went in turn ‘to the tragedians, the dithyrambic poets, and all the others’ to test their *sophia*, only to find that this wisdom was of the wrong sort — with a play on the notion of poets as *sophistai*, long traditional.⁹³ In the *Gorgias* (501d-502c), Sokrates attacks *auletikê*, *kitharôidikê*, choral poetry generally and dithyramb as all being driven by the pleasure of the audience. In the *Ion* (533d-534e), the poets of dithyrambs, encomia, hyporchemes, epic, and iambic are all tarred with the same brush for their irrational inspirations — although they are suggestively compared to *Bacchai*. Similarly in the *Laws* (700d) no one genre is to blame, but rather the poets’ reckless abandon in mixing them together, lamentations with hymns, paians with dithyrambs. Here too, however, we find the interesting description of these poets as ‘Bacchically raving (βακχεύοντες) and seized by pleasure more than necessary’ (700d).

On a purely technical level, then, the dithyrambic poets bear no original responsibility for the Demise of Music, even if this is exactly what a later author like Dionysius of Halikarnassos claims.⁹⁴ That burden must be borne by the poets and musicians as a pan-generic group, whose fragments give us a glimpse of their debates amongst themselves about technical innovations. Thus in the well-known passage of the *Laws* (700e-701a), Plato does not simply oppose the aristocracy of the old music to the democracy of the new. The *dêmos* is qualified rather as a teatrocracy, that is, empowered observers; those they observe, the poets and musicians, constitute a sort of *boulê* within the musical democracy. Plato portrays them, under the guiding principle of pleasure, ‘composing poems of that sort, and on top of it making speeches (*logoi*) to the same effect’. These *logoi* may not have been limited to polemical poetics, but actually delivered as lectures, and even published ‘in print’.⁹⁵ They decided amongst themselves the new laws of music, which, in relation to the old musical customs, were seen by conservatives as *paranomia*.

But because the poet is a ‘delicate affair, winged and holy’ — as Plato expresses it with a Cinesian touch — and, as seen in the *Ion*, cannot be held to rational account, he is excused, despite his self-indulgence in *tekhnê*, from ultimate responsibility for the Ruin of Music. The poets heed a higher voice: their new *nomoi* must be ratified by teatrocratic applause. Indeed, it is not the poets who ruined music, but the *dêmos* which ‘has ruined (διέφθαρκε) the poets themselves’ through the institution of public accountability. By playing to the base pleasure of the people, the poets ended up as students of the *dêmos*, which in effect taught them how to compose debased, vulgar music.⁹⁶

It is now that the dithyramb comes to the fore. As Plato states in the *Laws*, ‘if a democracy of free men had come about only in music, the outcome would not have been all that bad’.⁹⁷ But, according to the magnet theory of musical influence espoused in the *Ion*, a chain reaction runs from the poet to the choros-trainers, sub-trainers, and choreuts, so that all become infected with the same spirit which drives the poet (536b). In the *Laws* the process is explained in terms of mimesis, so that a performer eventually takes on the character of the music he or she performs (655d–656b). Since all choral music is held to be mimetic, all who receive choral training under the New Music will take on the character of its composers so that, for instance, those who dance the *purrrhikhê* of

Kinesias will become, as Dikaios Logos complains in the *Clouds*, too wimpy to hold up their shields (*Nub.* 987–9).

Thus, says Plato, the refusal to honour established musical *nomoi* led to a more general *paranoia*: refusal to obey one's rulers, shirking one's duties, insulting one's parents, and finally dishonouring the gods (*Leg.* 701a–b). Once again, we are glimpsing more than just Plato's own theory: this is precisely the sequence explored in *Clouds*. Whatever Aristophanes felt himself, it must have been a common contemporary point of view to have gained a comic airing. It was in this generation that Diagoras of Melos and Kinesias — both *dithyrambopoioi* — were charged with, in the one case, mocking the Eleusinian mysteries, and in the other general impiety towards the gods.⁹⁸ That Aristophanes escaped the same charge with *Frogs* may owe much to the play's message of regeneration, with its immortal choros of Eleusinian initiates (who may indeed allude to both Kinesias and Diagoras in the same scene).⁹⁹ By contrast Kinesias was branded a 'prophet of decay' (φθόης προφήτης) by Plato Comicus (*PCG* 200.4) and 'choros killer' (χοροκτόνος) by Strattis (*PCG* 16). But doubtless Plato's issue of generic boundaries also came into play. Whereas any matter was, at most times, fair play in Old Comedy, the 'cosmic' dithyramb probably maintained enough religious and/or political potency in late fifth century Athens that it would ill tolerate any comic or sophistic admixture. Csapo (2008) has argued that, while dithyramb benefitted from 'the language, imagery, and ideas' of mystery cult 'from the beginning' (286), the New Music choreographers may have taken this to a new level in pursuit of mimetic effects. This was perhaps uncharted territory with large gray areas. Were some dithyrambists seen as heralds of new interpretations of traditional rites, presented by circular choroses dancing the very occasions being reinterpreted?¹⁰⁰ Did these poems approximate some sort of sophistic commentary, like one sees in the Derveni Papyrus, on the ritual 'text' of the dithyramb? According to one ancient critic, Aristophanes lumped the dithyrambic 'songbenders' together with the larger class of sophists — a reasonable interpretation of the passage.¹⁰¹

Given Plato's view in the *Republic* that tragedy was the most mimetic form, whereas the dithyramb's use of narrative made it somewhat less so, one might predict that tragedy should have constituted a greater danger (392d–398b). But here perhaps we may sidestep the entanglements of Platonic (and Aristotelian) theory in favour of what must have been obvious to those concerned.¹⁰² The massive scale of dithyrambic performance in Athens would have posed the greatest continual threat to the greatest number of people: it was a participatory mass medium for the spread of New Musical ideas, which might be accompanied by whatever else, from the ridiculous to the atheistic, that the poets, if unrestrained, chose to present. We know in our own times that the most challenging new music often comes to be embraced by singers and musicians who have learned it by heart in week after week of rehearsals. In Athens these probable converts numbered many hundreds of men and boys each year, many thousands over each generation.

From this point of view, then, we might concur with the scholiast that dithyramb *did* cause the demise of music. Or its Dionysian rebirth, to take the side of the wider Athenian public which eventually approved the movement and determined, by voting with applause, a new musical order. In narrow technical terms, however, the dithyramb could be made the culprit only through a retrospective fallacy of the conspicuous. The

view that the later dithyrambic poets bore responsibility for excessive melodic modulation is found, along with other distortions, in the passage of Dionysius of Halikarnassos cited above. It might already have seemed to Herakleides of Pontus, Chamaeleon, and Aristoxenos that Lasos had started it all.¹⁰³

And in a crucial respect Lasos was a *prôtos heuretês*, establishing a system of democratic dithyramb in support of the Kleisthenic reforms (c.509), in effect a massive musical ritual of social catharsis following the expulsion of the Peisistratids and the ensuing *stasis*.¹⁰⁴ In doing so he put the Athenian *dêmos* on imitate terms with the polyphonic *aulos* music for which (among other qualifications) the Peisistratids must have brought him to Athens from the progressive Argolid, and thereby created favourable conditions for its continued evolution.

Initially the tastes of mass and elite must have largely coincided; at any rate the artistic tastes of the organizers, typically importing foreign talent, would have prevailed when the democratic dithyramb was first launched.¹⁰⁵ This familiar dichotomy is, to be sure, somewhat reductive and facile here. No doubt the ‘old music’ — in which we must now include the early *polyphônia* discussed above — continued to please much of the public, the average Strepsiades. Conversely, some proponents of the New Music, like their young imitators at the house of the *kithara*-teacher, were themselves of aristocratic birth.¹⁰⁶ The precedents of Lasos, Simonides and Pindar must have made musical innovation seem a noble calling to some, an inherent aspect of the *kalon* in music. Had not Homer himself declared that ‘men celebrate more whatever song is newest’ (*Od.* 1.351 f.)?

All the same, those not participating in the *paideia* and *symposia* of the notables could not have felt the same ancient loyalty and sentiment to the Archaic style which was cultivated there, nor did they have any vested social interest in its preservation. Indeed, the *Old Oligarch* suggests that the *dêmos* reacted consciously against the ‘good old music’, refusing to recognize it as *kalon* precisely because it had not enjoyed the opportunities of these elite contexts.¹⁰⁷ From the musical rules grounded in the ancient lyre tradition — ‘the harmonia which our fathers handed down’ — the *aulos* was increasingly emancipated on the public stages of Athens. The divergence of tastes was gradual; accepting (and supporting) the later dating of Pratinas *PMG* 708, two or three generations, roughly sixty years (and many hundred dithyrambic performances), separate the Kleisthenic reform from the earliest evidence of reaction to what now emerged as the New Music.¹⁰⁸ The *aulos* was the driving force of this movement not because it was an inherently demotic instrument — quite the contrary in earlier generations — but because, from a technical point of view, the peculiar properties of its construction made it better suited for the cultivation of *polyphônia*. But because the instrument was firmly embedded in the performance practice of the fifth-century Athenian dithyramb, the ‘Songbenders of Circular Choroses’, even if their creative output was not limited to this genre, were indeed crucial for the further and further elaboration of the polyphonic style which eventually, for some, caused the Demise of Music.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, W. D., 'Word Accent and Melody in Ancient Greek Musical Texts', *Journal of Music Theory* 17.2 (1973), 186–203.
- Andrewes, A., *The Greek Tyrants* (London, 1956).
- Barker, A., 'The Innovations of Lysander the Kitharist', *CQ* 32 (1982), 266–69.
- Barker, A., *Greek Musical Writings*. 2 volumes (Cambridge, 1984–1989).
- Barker, A., 'Heterophonia and poikilia: accompaniments to Greek melody', in Gentili, B./Perusino, F. (eds.), *Mousike: Metrica Ritmica e Musica Greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti* (Pisa and Rome, 1995), 41–60.
- Barker, A., 'Transforming the Nightingale: Aspects of Athenian Musical Discourse in the Late Fifth Century', in Murray/Wilson (2004), 184–204.
- Bliquez, L. J., 'The PURRIXH of Kinesias, a Pun? Aristophanes, *Frogs* 153', *CQ* 58.1 (2008), 320–6.
- Borthwick, E. K., 'Notes on the Plutarch *De musica* and the *Cheiron* of Pherekrates', *Hermes* 96 (1968), 60–73.
- Brancacci, A., 'Alcidamante e PHibeh 13 "De musica": Musica della retorica e retorica della musica', in *Aristoxenica, Menandrea, Fragmenta Philosophica.*, ed. A. Brancacci/et al. (Naples, 1988), 61–84.
- Burkert, W., *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Cambridge Mass., 1992 < German 1984).
- Brussich, G. F., *Laso di Ermione. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Pisa, 2000).
- Ceccarelli, P., 'Le dithyrambe et la pyrrhique: à propos de la nouvelle liste de vainqueurs aux Dionysies de Cos (Sgre, ED 234)', *ZPE* 108 (1995), 287–305.
- Ceccarelli, P., *La pirrica nell'antichità greco-romana: Studi sulla danza armata* (Pisa and Rome, 1998).
- Ceccarelli, P./Milanezi, S., 'Dithyramb, Tragedy — and Cyrene', in Wilson (2007a), 185–214.
- Clay, J. S., *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge, 2003).
- Comotti, G., 'L'anabolé e il ditirambo', *QUCC* 60 (n.s. 31) (1989), 107–17.
- Cordano, F., 'La città di Camarina e le corde della lira', *Parola del Passato* 49 (1994), 418–26.
- Csapo, E., 'The Politics of the New Music' in Murray/Wilson (2004), 207–48.
- Csapo, E., 'Star Choroses: Eleusis, Orphism, and New Musical Imagery and Dance', in Revermann, M./Wilson, P. (ed.), *Star Choroses: Eleusis, Orphism, and New Musical Imagery and Dance* (Oxford and New York, 2008), 262–90.
- D'Angour, A., 'How the dithyramb got its shape', *CQ* 47 (1997), 331–51.
- Dobrov, G./Urios-Aparisi, E., 'The Maculate Music: Gender, Genre, and the *Chiron* of Pherekrates', in *Beyond Aristophanes: transition and diversity in Greek comedy*, ed. G. Dobrov (Atlanta, 1995), 138–74.
- Dover, K. J., *Aristophanes Frogs* (Oxford, 1993).
- Dunbar, N., *Aristophanes Birds: Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford 1995).
- Düring, I., 'Studies in Musical Terminology in 5th Century Literature', *Eranos* 43 (1945), 176–97.
- Ebeling, E., *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts* (Leipzig, 1919).
- Etienne, R., *Ténos II* (Athens, 1990).
- Fowler, R. L., 'Aristotle on the Period (*Rhet.* 3.9)', *CQ* n.s. 32.1 (1982), 89–99.

- Franklin, J. C., 'Diatonic Music in Greece: A Reassessment of its Antiquity', *Mnemosyne* 56.1 (2002a), 669–702.
- Franklin, J. C., 'Musical Syncretism and the Greek Orientalizing Period', Hickmann, E./Eichmann, R./Kilmer, A. (eds.), *Archäologie früher Klangerzeugung und Tonordnungen*. Serie Studien zur Musikarchäologie, Orient-Archäologie (Berlin, 2002b), 441–51.
- Franklin, J. C., 'The Language of Musical Technique in Greek Epic Diction', *Gaia. Revue interdisciplinaire sur la Grèce archaïque* n°7 (2003), 295–307.
- Franklin, J. C., 'Hearing Greek Microtones', in Hagel, S. /Harrauer, C. *Ancient Greek Music in Performance* (Vienna, 2005), 9–50.
- Franklin, J. C., 'Lyre Gods of the Bronze Age Musical Koine', *The Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 6.2 (2006).
- Franklin, J. C., 'The Global Economy of Music in the Ancient Near East', in Westenholz, J. G. (ed.), *Sounds of Ancient Music* (Jerusalem, 2007), 27–37.
- Froning, H., *Dithyrambos und Vasenmalerei in Athen* (Würzburg, 1971).
- Gentili, B., *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece from Homer to the Fifth Century* (Baltimore, Maryland, 1988 < Rome and Bari, 1984).
- Goldhill, S./Osborne, R. (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge, 1999).
- Griffin, A., *Sikyon* (Oxford, 1982).
- Hagel, S., *Modulation in altgriechischer Musik: Antike Melodien im Licht antiker Musiktheorie* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000).
- Hagel, S., 'Twenty-four in auloi. Aristotle, Met. 1093b, the harmony of the spheres, and the formation of the Perfect System', in *Ancient Greek Music in Performance*, ed. S. Hagel/C. Harrauer (Vienna, 2005), 51–92.
- Harmon, R., 'From Themostocles to Philomathes: *Amousos* and *amousia* in Antiquity and the Early Modern Period', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 9/3 (2003), 351–90.
- Henderson, J., *The Maculate Muse*¹ (New Haven and London, 1975).
- Homolle, Th., 'Inscription de Delphes', *BCH* 22 (1898), 260–70.
- Hornblower, S., 'Pindar and Chios', in A. Matthaïou (ed.) *CIAKON SUMPOSITION EIS MNHMHN W. G. FORREST* (Athens, 2006) 173–83.
- Huchzermeyer, H. *Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit* (Emsdetten, 1931).
- Ieranò, G., 'Arione e Corinto', *QUCC* 41 (1992), 39–52.
- Ieranò, G., *Il Dittirambo di Dioniso: le testimonianze antiche* (Pisa/Rome, 1997).
- Kayser, H., *Paestum* (Heidelberg, 1958).
- Kilmer, A. D., 'Musik. A. I. In Mesopotamien', in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 8 (1997), 463–82.
- Koller, H., 'Das kitharodische Prooimion', *Philologus* 100 (1956), 159–206.
- Kowalzig, B., 'Changing Choral Worlds: Song-Dance and Society in Athens and Beyond', in Murray/Wilson (2004), 39–65.
- Kowalzig, B., 'And Now All the World Shall Dance: Dionysos' choroi between Drama and Ritual', in Csapo, E./Miller, M. (ed.), *The Origins of Theatre in Ancient Greece and Beyond: From Ritual to Drama* (Cambridge and New York, 2007), 221–53.

- Lasserre, F., *Plutarch. De la musique* (Olten-Lausanne, 1954).
- Laroche, E., 'Documents en langue hourrite provenant de Ras Shamra II. Textes hourrites en cunéiformes syllabiques', *Ugaritica* 5 (1968), 462–96.
- Laroche, E., 'Notation Musicale', *Revue d'Assyriologie* 67 (1973), 124–9.
- Lavecchia, S., *Pindari Dithyramborum Fragmenta* (Rome/Pisa, 2000).
- Lawler, L. B., "'Limewood" Kinesias and the Dithyrambic Dance', *TAPA* 81 (1950), 78–88.
- Lawler, L. B., 'Cosmic Dance and Dithyramb', in *Studies in honor of Ullman, presented to him on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday*, ed. L. B. Lawler/D. M. Robathan/W. C. Korfmacher (St. Louis, 1960), 12–16.
- Lonsdale, S., *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion* (Baltimore and London, 1993).
- Markoe, G., *Phoenician Bronze and Silver Bowls from Cyprus and the Mediterranean* (Berkeley, 1985).
- Martin, R. P., 'The Pipes are Brawling: Conceptualizing Musical Performance in Athens', in Dougherty, C./Kurke, L. (eds.), *The Cultures Within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration* (Cambridge and New York, 2003), 153–80.
- Mendelsohn, D., 'Συγκεραυνόω: Dithyrambic Language and the Dionysiac Cult', *CJ* 87 (1992), 105–24.
- Monro, D. B., *The Modes of Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford 1894).
- Moshammer, A. A., 'The Date of the First Pythiad — Again', *GRBS* 23 (1982), 15–30.
- Mullen, W., *Choreia: Pindar and Dance* (Princeton, 1982).
- Murray, P./Wilson, P. (eds.) *Music and the Muses: the Culture of 'Mousike' in the Classical Athenian City*, Oxford (2004).
- Musti, D., 'Musica greca tra aristocrazia e democrazia' in Cassio, A. C./Musti, D./Rossi, L. E. (eds.), *Synaulía. cultura musicale in grecia e contatti mediterranei A.I.O.N. 5* (Naples, 2000), 7–55.
- Napolitano, M., 'Note all'iporchema di Pratina', in Cassio/Musti/Rossi (2000), 111–41.
- Pianko, G., 'Un comico contributo alla storia della musica greca', *Eos* 53 (1963), 56–62.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W., *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford 1927, second edition revised by T. B. L. Webster, 1962).
- Porter, J., 'Lasos of Hermione, Pindar, and the Riddle of S', *CQ* 57.1 (2007), 1–21.
- Power, T., 'Ion of Chios and the Politics of Polychordia', in Jennings, V./Katsaros, A. (ed.), *Ion of Chios and the Politics of Polychordia* (Leiden and Boston, 2007), 179–205.
- Prauscello, L., "'Epinician Sounds" and their Reception: Pindar and Musical Innovation', in Rawles, R. et al. (ed.), *"Epinician Sounds" and their Reception: Pindar and Musical Innovation* (Cambridge, forthcoming).
- Privitera, G. A., *Laso di Ermione nella cultura ateniese e nella tradizione storiografica* (Rome, 1965).
- Restani, D., 'Il Cheirone di Ferecrate e la 'nuova' musica greca', *Rivista italiana di musicologia* 18.2 (1983), 139–92.
- Richter, L., 'Die neue Musik der griechischen Antike', *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 25 (1968), 1–18, 134–47.

- Russo, J., 'Stesichoros, Homer, and the Forms of Early Greek Epic', in Kazazis, J. N./Rengakos, A. (ed.), *Stesichoros, Homer, and the Forms of Early Greek Epic* (Stuttgart, 1999), 339–48.
- Seaford, R., 'The "Hyporchema" of Pratinas', *Maia* 29 (1977–1978), 81–94.
- Visconti, A., *Aristosseno di Taranto: biografia e formazione spirituale* (Naples, 1999).
- Wallace, R. W., 'Damone di Oa ed i suoi successori: un'analisi delle fonti', in Wallace, R. W./MacLachlan, B. (ed.), *Harmonia Mundi: Musica e Filosofia nell' Antichità* (Roma 1991), 30–53.
- Wallace, R. W., 'Music Theorists in Fourth-Century Athens', in Gentili, B./Perusino, F. (eds.), *Mousike: Metrica Ritmica e Musica Greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti* (Pisa and Rome, 1995), 17–40.
- Wallace, R. W., 'An Early Fifth-Century Athenian Revolution in Aulos Music', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101 (2003), 73–92.
- Weil, H./Reinach, Th., *Plutarque, De la musique* (Paris, 1900).
- West, M. L., *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford, 1992a).
- West, M. L., 'Analecta Musica', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 92 (1992b), 1–54.
- Westphal, R., *Harmonik und Melopöie der Griechen* (Leipzig, 1867).
- Wilson, P., 'The Aulos in Athens', in Goldhill/Osborne (1999), 58–95.
- Wilson, P., *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Choros, the City and the Stage* (Cambridge 2000).
- Wilson, P., review of Lavechhia (2000), *BMCR* 2002.04.2.
- Wilson, P., 'The politics of dance: Dithyrambic contest and social order in ancient Greece', in Phillips, D. J./Pritchard, D. (eds.), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea, 2003a), 163–96.
- Wilson, P., 'The Sound of Cultural Conflict: Kritias and the Culture of *Mousikê* in Athens', in Dougherty, C. /Kurke, L. (eds.), *The cultures within ancient Greek culture: contact, conflict, collaboration* (Cambridge and New York, 2003b), 181–206.
- Wilson, P., 'Athenian Strings', in Murray/Wilson (2004), 269–306.
- Wilson, P. (ed.), *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies* (Oxford, 2007a).
- Wilson, P., 'Performance in the Pythion: The Athenian Thargelia', in Wilson (2007b), 150–82.
- Wilson, P. 'Pronomos and Potamon: Two Pipers and Two Epigrams', *JHS* 127 (2007c), 141–9.
- Wilson, P./Murray, P. (eds.), *Music and the Muses. The Culture of 'Mousikê' in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford, 2004).
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P., 'The Spondeian Scale', *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1928), 83–91.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P., *Mode in Ancient Greek Music* (Cambridge 1936).
- Woodbury, L., 'The date and atheism of Diagoras of Melos', *Phoenix* 19.3 (1965), 178–211.
- Zielinski, T., *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komoedie* (Leipzig, 1885).
- Zimmermann, B., *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung* (Göttingen, 1992).
- Zimmermann, B., 'Comedy's Criticism of Music', in *Intertextualität in der griechisch-römischen Komödie*, ed. N. W. Slater/B. Zimmermann (Stuttgart, 1993), 39–50.

¹ Σ *Ar. Nub.* 333d; cf. *Suda* s.v. κυκλίων τε χορῶν, containing the variant διαφοράν which, though less virulent, sustains this investigation. For Aristophanes' further (often implicit) treatment of dithyramb, both in *Clouds* and elsewhere, see Ieranò in this volume.

² *Ar. Ran.* 1301, 1304 ff. (with *Eur. Hyps.* 194–201), *Vesp.* 1346 f.; *Ec.* 877–92; *Ameipsias PCG* 21; *Nicophon PCG* 8. See Henderson (1975), 183–5; Dobrov/Urios-Aparisi (1995); Barker (2004), 184–204, 198 f.

³ [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.13; cf. Wilson (2000), 14. Note also [Plut.] *De mus.* 1142d (probably from Aristoxenos): 'if someone wishes to make good use of music (μουσικῇ καλῶς . . . χρῆσθαι), let him imitate the ancient style'; *Aristid. Or.* 3.231. In these passages καλὸν/καλῶς, besides its familiar social connotations, echoes a specifically musical usage in Archaic poetics, where it has a close connection with the lyre: e.g. *Alcm. fr.* 41 *PMGF*; *h. Merc.* 32, 38; see further Franklin (2003), 300 f. For Aristoxenos' fr. 83, on the aulete Olympos' invention of 'the noble and Greek' enharmonic, see below.

⁴ For the New Music generally, Richter (1968); for recent analyses of the reaction against it, Wilson (1999); Wilson (2003b); Csapo (2004).

⁵ See e.g. Privitera (1965), 80; Dobrov/Urios-Aparisi (1995), 173 f. treat the New Music as practically coterminous with the dithyramb, at least from the perspective of the comic poets; Musti (2000) generally seems to sympathize with the idea of a 'decline' in Greek music at this period. For the testimony of *Dion. Hal. Comp.* 19, see below n. 90/0000.

⁶ Cf. Musti (2000), 9 f. The usual exception of Hesiod is only partially valid, since he too performed in that environment; see also observations of Clay (2003), 5 f.

⁷ For the professionalism of the New Music, see recently Csapo (2004), and further below.

⁸ On Plato, cf. Musti (2000), 24.

⁹ Modulation (μεταβολή in Aristoxenos) is the use of more than one tuning in a composition. The present argument does not require a precise technical understanding of the practice, for which see now Hagel (2000); Franklin (2002a), 693–8.

¹⁰ *Pol.* 1340b20–41b8, echoed by *Ath.* 184d.

¹¹ Those interested must address the studies of Hagel (2000) and (2005). I wish them the joy of the labour. See also below, n. 41.

¹² *Pl. Resp.* 399c–d; cf. *Pl. Leg.* 700d: ποιηταὶ . . . ἀλῶδίας δὲ ταῖς κιθαρῶδiais μιμούμενοι.

¹³ See testimonia in Ieranò (1997), 91–104; Mendelsohn (1992); Ford, D'Angour, Hedreen and Peponi in this volume.

¹⁴ [Plut.] *De mus.* 1138b–c. For the attribution to Aristoxenos, cf. Privitera (1965), 80. Compare the usage of Aristoxenos later in the same treatise (fr. 76 = [Plut.] *De mus.* 1142bc), the description of Telesias of Thebes becoming enamoured of 'complex music' (ποικίλη μουσική), and of this the 'most complex pieces' (τὰ ποικιλώτατα).

¹⁵ Wehrli ad *Aristox.* fr. 83; cf. Brussich (2000), 15.

¹⁶ The synchronism with Melanippides (on the basis of the Aristoxenian testimony in [Plutarch 1141cd) makes the later dating of this fragment, and hence the existence of a younger Pratinas as its author, very attractive. In this case, φρυνέου ποικίλου will refer, if to anybody, not Phrynichus but Phrynīs — a much more probable target in connection

with the New Music. For the extensive literature on this question, see Pickard-Cambridge (1962), 17 n. 6; Seaford (1977–8); Napolitano (2000); Wallace (2003), 84 f.; Csapo (2004), 214 and n. 30. For ποικιλόπτερον μέλος, note also Barker (1995), 46 f.

¹⁷ For such poetic debates, cf. Gentili (1988), 62 ff. For a different (but perhaps compatible) reading of this repetition of *poikil-*, see recently Martin (2003), 165 f. For further aspects of tonal *poikilia*, Barker (1995). For the poetic elaboration of technical language in the Archaic period, see Franklin (2003).

¹⁸ Cf. Wilson (2003a). A text I have not seen cited in this connection is Plutarch's brief discussion of the relative merits of various forms of government, in which democracy is branded *polyphthongos* and *polykhordos* (*Mor.* 827b).

¹⁹ Franklin (2002a), 686 and n. 47; for *heptatonos*, 673–9 (and see below).

²⁰ For other aspects of the opposition, and the focus on the second half of the fifth century, Martin (2003); cf. Wilson (1999); Musti (2000), 12; Wilson (2004).

²¹ This is clear both from literary evidence and Archaic iconography. See Huchzermeyer (1931), 48 and as a whole; cf. Martin (2003), 170 f. An anonymous reader also calls attention [Plut.] *De mus.* 1133F: Glaucus of Rhegium linked the kitharoidic style of Stesichoros with the aulete Olympos. The competition categories of the major festivals are misleading in this respect; and these were adopted as an organizing principal by the Classical and Hellenistic musicographers (see [Plut.] *De mus. passim*). The pairing of the instruments is also well-known from first-millennium Near Eastern representations, e.g. the numerous musical scenes on the Cypro-Phoenician bowls: Markoe (1985).

²² Hom. *Il.* 9.186, of Achilles (but note the ethical interpretation of [Plut.] *De mus.* 1145f); *Od.* 17.385; *Hymn. Hom. Merc.* 421 f. (cf. 499); 434, 447 f., 506; Simonides (?) *PMG* 947b. Musti (2000) follows Plato too far in stressing the moral in the music of the elite.

²³ For Themistocles, see now Harmon (2003).

²⁴ It is necessary here to introduce, and appreciate, the term 'diatonic' in its strict ancient sense (*diatonos*), that is, a heptatonic tuning constructed solely through perfect fourths and fifths. Note the *hysteron proteron* of the latter terms, which describe the phenomena which *result* from an anterior and purely aural process. This method, known to Aristoxenus as 'taking through consonance' (*hê lêpsis dia sumphônion*), is inextricably allied with heptatony: Aristoxenus' law of 'continuity' (*synecheia*), which was his 'first principle' (*archê*) of *harmonikê*, ensured that all genera of scales (diatonic, chromatic, enharmonic), would have a proper heptatonic, and *a fortiori* diatonic, structure. Likewise the Mesopotamian system is both heptatonic and diatonic. See further Franklin (2002a), 698 f., (2002b), 443; and most lucidly (2005), 19–22.

²⁵ Ebeling (1919), no. 158 (whence it is referred to as KAR 158 in much earlier bibliography). For the discovery and reconstruction of the Mesopotamian heptatonic/diatonic system, see Kilmer (1997) with further bibliography (and 468, 475 for text of VAT 10101 incorporating later restorations).

²⁶ For the texts, Laroche (1968); for the notation system, Laroche (1973) and further bibliography in Kilmer (1997).

²⁷ For this 'international style' of music, and its reflection in the phenomenon of deified temple lyres, see further Franklin (2006); (2007).

²⁸ The essential argument is that the Greek tradition of diatonic music, intimately connected to the seven-stringed lyre, is related to the diatonic system known in cuneiform sources going back to the Old Babylonian period and beyond. See Franklin (2002a), (2005), 13–22.

²⁹ In Tenos and post-Gelan Camarina: see Etienne (1990), 70 f.; Cordano (1994); Wilson (2004), 280. What procedure was followed is not clear from the evidence. One should note here the use, alleged by Kayser (1958), of musical ratios in temple construction at Paestum (which I cannot yet judge). For Delphi's musical management of political affairs, cf. Franklin (2006). For musical catharses at Sparta, [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134b, 1146bc; Ael. *VH* 12.50; cf. Burkert (1992), 42.

³⁰ Aristox. fr. 83, cf. Franklin (2002a), 670 f. and see generally Winnington-Ingram (1928); Barker (1984–9), 1.255 ff. That this is a genuine (if perhaps inexact) tradition is confirmed both by Aristoxenos' appeal to the general belief of musicians (ὑπολαμβάνεται ὑπὸ τῶν μουσικῶν, 1134f), and his invocation of auletes who still play in an archaic style; the same is seen in the first sections of the Delphic paean of Athenaeus (*DAGM* 20). I leave aside the 'gapped' lyre evidence of Philolaus and the Aristotelian problems, a special case I shall discuss elsewhere. For Olympos, [Plut.] *De mus.* 1135a (= Aristox. fr. 83). The *harmoniai* recorded by Aristides Quintilianus 1.9 as those known to Plato and connected with the school of Damon (see Winnington-Ingram (1936), 55 ff.; West (1992), 174 f. and n. 47) are clearly genuine: Hagel (2000), 164–78 has shown that these very scales lie behind one of the early *tonoi* systems alluded to by Aristoxenos (*Harm.* 37), who connects them with *aulos* music. The 'Damonian' names reappear almost exactly in Pollux, who states that they were auletic 'tunings' (4.78); cf. [Plut.] *De mus.* 1136b–1137a, with the comments of Monro (1894), 22 and n. 1. Note finally that Damon's music teachers in the biographical tradition also have connections with the *aulos*: Wallace (2003), 74 and n. 6.

³¹ Franklin (2002a); Franklin (2005), 13–22.

³² For the chronology of the diatonic, Aristox. *Harm.* 19 with Franklin (2002a), 672 f.

³³ For Arion and the dithyramb see generally Pickard-Cambridge (1962), 11 f.; Zimmermann (1992), 24–9; Ieranò (1992); Brussich (2000), 20; Kowalzig, this volume.

³⁴ See Power in this volume on Archil. 120–1 West (for the kitharoidic resonance of ἐξάρξαι in 120, see below). For the generic treatment of dithyramb under the heading of 'lyric' or 'melic' (Tzetzes, Proclus), see in this volume Peponi, Calame.

³⁵ Hellanic. *FGrH* 4 F 85–6: cf. West (1992a), 330 n. 8. Arion is elsewhere linked with Terperander by Aristid. 2.336; Procl. *Chr.* ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 320a5; *Suda* s.v. Ἀρίων. Sparta and the Carneia are discussed here by D'Alessio.

³⁶ This was pointed out by Martin West in discussion; cf. Koller (1956), 160 f.

³⁷ See recently Russo (1999); cf. D'Alessio in this volume

³⁸ Cf. West (1992a), 339 and n. 48. Against this, however, must be set such usages as Arist. *Po.* 1449a11 (οἱ ἐξάρχοντες τὸν διθύραμβον), etc. For Archilochus, see generally Ieranò (1997), 175–85; for choral *exarchoi* at Cyrene, Ceccarelli/Milanezi (2007), 191, 210–13; cf. D'Alessio in this volume. If ἐξάρχων in fr. 121 W is made suspicious by πρὸς αὐλὸν Λέσβιον (cf. Power, this volume), note that Athenaeus (180d) cites this verse (and others) in support of the claim that 'leading off' is 'proper to

the lyre' (τῆς φόρμιγγος ἴδιον). This accords perfectly well with the paeanic setting: again the mere presence of an αὐλός can not be taken to *exclude* strings.

³⁹ Σ Ar. *Vesp.* 714, Σ Eur. *And.* 682; cf. Σ Eur. *Hec.* 40.

⁴⁰ Callim. Hymn 4.312f. ἐγειρομένου κιθαρισμοῦ / κύκλιον ὠρχήσαντο, χοροῦ δ' ἡγήσατο Θησεύς.

⁴¹ Pickard-Cambridge (1962), 3.

⁴² See now Wilson (2007b), 175–82; cf. 169 for the Thargelia, in which Theseus mythology was equally prominent, as perhaps 'an enclave for a less "modern" form of performance'.

⁴³ For ἡ Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφή, *FGrH* 124 T 23.

⁴⁴ Paus. 10.7.2 f., with the scholiastic hypotheses to Pindar's *Pythians* (4.1, 24–6 Dr); cf. West (1992a), 337. Enduring kitharoidic character at Delphi: Magnesians Chronicle, *FGrH* 482 F 2; *SIG*³ 557; cf. Moshammer (1982), 29 f. For the reorganization date 582/1, rather than four years earlier as stated by Pausanias (10.7.4–5; cf. [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1134a), see Moshammer (1982).

⁴⁵ *SEG* 15.517; Webster ap. Pickard-Cambridge (1962), 10.

⁴⁶ *IG* 2.3.1367. See Pickard-Cambridge (1927), 76; Ieranò (1997), test. 156a (Sutton 77 F 1), 159–38 BC; 156b (Sutton 78 F 1). The lyre-playing Satyr called Dithyramphos (Attic red-figure c.450, Copenhagen 97) is early enough to refer to the old 'Arionic' style: see Pickard-Cambridge (1962), 5 fig. 1; cf. 20 for New York 25.78.66, satyrs with lyres at the Panathenaea. See also Hedreen (2007), 164–9 (*non vidi*), and Heinemann's paper in this volume; cf. also material collected in Froning (1971). P. Ceccarelli (also this volume) discusses a wide geographical range of epigraphic evidence from the Hellenistic period and later, some of which may be relevant; of course the reciprocal influence of dithyramb and kitharoidic *nomos* in the late fifth and fourth centuries is undoubted.

⁴⁷ Σ Ar. *Nub.* 595: μιμεῖται τῶν διθυραμβοποιῶν καὶ κιθαρωδῶν τὰ προοίμια.

⁴⁸ Barker (1984–9), 1.56 n. 7; West (1992a), 205, 357 f.

⁴⁹ Comotti (1989), 115 f., citing Arist. *Po.* 1449a9 for the kitharoidic *exarkhos*; see also Koller (1956), 170–4; West (1992), 349.

⁵⁰ For Thargelia and elsewhere, see with further references (ancient and modern) Wilson (2003a), 170 f., (2007b), and in this volume. Kyrene: Ceccarelli/Milanezi (2007). See also Ceccarelli in this volume, who examines the phrase *kyklioi choroi* from many parts of the Greek world, showing that it often cannot be strictly equated with dithyramb.

⁵¹ See Lonsdale (1993), 44–75; Kowalzig (2004), with further literature.

⁵² Kowalzig (2007a), 129–80; also both Kowalzig and Prauscello in this volume.

- ⁵³ [Plut.] *De mus.* 1141c. For new arguments about the ‘dithyrambic *agôgê*’, see Prauscello in this volume. For further technical speculation on the passage, see Weil/Reinach (1900), 116 n. 294; Lasserre (1954), 37; Privitera (1965), 78 f.; Prauscello (forthcoming a) with further references.
- ⁵⁴ For the Arion-Lasos articulation, see especially Σ Pi. *Ol.* 26 (1.362 Drachmann); cf. [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1141c. See also Ieranò, D’Alessio in this volume.
- ⁵⁵ In this volume see also D’Angour, Hedreen, D’Alessio. For the relevance of Sakadas to this riddle, see now Porter (2007).
- ⁵⁶ [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134a–b, cf. 1131f–1132a = *FGrH* 550. Griffin (1982), 159 f. The variant *trimerês* does not affect the argument.
- ⁵⁷ Athena and *aulos*, *Pyth.* 12 (to the aulete Midas of Akragas); Polymnestos, fr. 188 (cf. [Plut.] *De mus.* 1133a); Olympos, fr. 157; for the *prooimion* to Sakadas, fr. 282 (Paus. 9.30.2; [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134a), cf. Porter (2007), 19 *et passim*; Wallace (2003), 80; *paian* of Xenocritos, Pind. fr. 140b (cf. D’Alessio in this volume). Pindar on the history of the dithyramb, fr. 70b + 81 + 346: cf. D’Angour (1997); Lavecchia (2000), 30–7. For the Orion dithyramb (fr. 71–4) and *PBerol.* 9571v, see Lavecchia (2000), 12, 64–6, 273 f.; Wilson (2002); Hornblower (2006).
- ⁵⁸ Griffin (1982), 159 f. follows the view that ‘it must have been written after the compilation of this list by Hellanicus in the second half of the fifth century’. But see also below for the idea of a shared musical movement in Argos and Sikyon.
- ⁵⁹ Hdt. 3.131–2; [Plut.] *De mus.* 1134bc); cf. West (1992a), 338, 343.
- ⁶⁰ Westphal (1867), 389 ff., with corrections of West (1992b), 38–42.
- ⁶¹ See further Franklin (2002a), 701; (2002b), 446 f.; (2005), 21 f. Aristoxenos in Arcadia: Visconti (1999), 64–88.
- ⁶² Pronomos: Paus. 9.12.5; Ath. 631e; for his dates, see now Wilson (2007c). Aristoxenos on the *aulos*: *Harm.* 42–43: cf. Franklin (2005), 16–18.
- ⁶³ Evidence collected by Griffin (1982), 158–64.
- ⁶⁴ Hdt. 5.67–8. Cf. Andrewes (1956), 58 f.; Griffin (1982), 158 f.; Kowalzig (2007b).
- ⁶⁵ See above, n. 0000.
- ⁶⁶ Ath. 637f (= Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 23). For informed speculation on Lysander’s pursuits, see Barker (1982).
- ⁶⁷ See e.g. Anderson (1966), 53.
- ⁶⁸ Simonides may well be the author of *PMG* 947b, in which the πολύχορδος αὐλός is celebrated; cf. Simon. *PMG* 578: ἤχόν τι παναρμόνιον; Theoc. 16.44 f. of Simonides: αἰόλα φωνέων / βάρβιτον ἐς πολύχορδον (‘singing shimmering tunes to the polychordal *barbitos*’).
- ⁶⁹ Πάμφωνος: Pi. *Ol.* 7.12 f., *Pyth.* 3.17, 12.19–23, *Isthm.* 5.26 f. Brussich (2000), 71 takes as *polykhordos*, but cf. Philox. *PMG* 831 (= Ath. 35d) εὐρείτας οἶνος πάμφωνος.
- ⁷⁰ For *poikilia* as *polychordia*, [Plut.] *De mus.* 1137a–b. See more generally the discussion of Barker (1995). For Pindar’s *poikilia*, see also Prauscella (forthcoming a) and, for Lasos, in this volume.
- ⁷¹ The generation(s) of Lasos, Simonides, and Pindar as a good old school: Ar. *Nub.* 1356, Av. 917 ff.; Pl. *Prot.* 316, *Resp.* 331e; Aristox. fr. 76 ap. [Plut.] *De mus.* 1142bc, cf. 1137ef; Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 19; Plut. *Nob.* 2.

⁷² Ion of Chios fr. 32 (West). See further below, and cf. Franklin (2002a), 694–8. For Ion, see below and n. 84. Power (2007) has at last provided an attractive sociological reading of the Ion fragment, which he sees as an elitist riddle, reflecting an aristocratic reaction against demotic incursions into the preserves of symposium and lyre. The verses’ technical details can be made to harmonize with this quite well. An eleven-stringed instrument, tuned to (putative) semitones, would express in a single plane the full ‘road-map’ of the diatonic cycle (see further Franklin [2002], 693 f.). It would thus be both outstandingly traditional, and dauntingly complex (cf. Aristophanes’ lampoon of Cleon’s ability to master only the Dorian *harmonia*: *Eq.* 985 f.).

⁷³ See e.g. *Harm.* 22 for modulation by *genos*; cf. Cleon. 205.6–206.2 (Jan).

⁷⁴ For *kampê* as non-perjorative, Pi. fr. 107a1–3 (see below); Timotheos calls Phrynīs the ‘Ionian melody-bender’ (*PMG* 802), but, though he boasts his victory over the older musician, it would be surprising if he intended this epithet to be insulting, given his own style.

⁷⁵ Restani (1984), 156–66; cf. Zimmermann (1992), 122 n. 4.

⁷⁶ Σ Ar. *Nub.* 332: διὰ τὸ ἁρμονίᾳ μὴ ὑποπίπτειν αὐτῶν τὰ συγγράμματα . . . καμπὰς ἔχουσι πλείονας, ἅς οἱ μουσικοὶ καλοῦσι στροφὰς καὶ ἀντιστροφούς καὶ ἐπωδούς. The reading διὰ τὸ ἁρμονίᾳ μὴ, printed by Dindorf following the *Suda* (s.v. κυκλίων τε χορῶν) is surely superior to the διὰ τὸ ἐναρμονίῳ ὑποπίπτειν of Koster and Holwerda.

⁷⁷ Ancient sources: Mullen (1982), 225–8; cf. Csapo (2008), 280 f.

⁷⁸ Demetr. *Eloc.* 10 ἔστιν γὰρ ἡ περίοδος σύστημα ἐκ κώλων ἢ κομμάτων εὐκαταστρόφως . . . ἀπηρτισμένον . . . καμπήν τέ τινα καὶ συστροφήν ἔχει κατὰ τὸ τέλος (‘For a period is a system assembled from clauses and phrases in a well-turned manner . . . [sc. the given example] has a certain turning-point and concision at the end’). Demetrius goes on to approve Aristotle’s image of the runner; cf. 17, where *kampê* is made the essential winding-up of a simple period. In Cic. *Att.* 1.14.4 *kampê* appears after *periodoi* in a list of Greek technical rhetorical terms. See also Restani (1982), 164. Note also the comment of Σ Ar. *Nub.* 332d, ἄσματοκάμπτας τοὺς διθυραμβοκόποιους, ἐπεὶ καμπὰς τὰς περιόδους λέγουσιν.

⁷⁹ For καμπή and καμπτήρ, LSJ s.vv. For Aristotle’s definition of the period, see generally Fowler (1982).

⁸⁰ Aeschylus and Euripides predict the rhetorical term when they use *kampê* to describe the end of an utterance or chain of thought. Aeschylus has ποῖ καταστρέφεις / λόγων τελευτήν, ‘Whither do you turn back the end of your speech’, or in the more intelligible translation of R. Potter, ‘To what fair end are these thy words / Directed?’ (*Pers.* 787 f., cf. *Ag.* 344). Euripides has μῦθον ἐς καμπήν ἄγε, ‘bring your story back to the point’ (*El.* 659). It is not clear, however, whether these metaphors refer directly and merely to racing imagery, or also comprise a level of choral poetics.

⁸¹ Wehrli ad Aristox. fr. 76 argued that Lasos had already done away with strophic form, but this is rightly rejected by Brussich (2000), 71; cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1962), 22–4.

⁸² Plut. *Mor.* 748a–c;

⁸³ Telestes *PMG* 808. Note also the loaded language of Eup. *PCG* 366: μουσική πρᾶγμα ἔστι βαθύ τι καὶ καμπύλον ('music is a rather deep and devious affair'). For Plato's rejection of polychordal instruments, see above n. 12.

⁸⁴ Pherecr. *PCG* 155.8–12. For detailed consideration of the larger fragment, including the various musical terms and puns, see Düring (1945); Pianko (1963); Borthwick (1968); Restani (1983); Barker (1984–9), 1.93–7, 236–8; Zimmermann (1992), 122 f.; (1993).

⁸⁵ Dobrov/Urios-Aparisi (1995) treat the fragment as a whole as belonging to 'comedy's evolving response to the dithyramb' (173), although elsewhere they recognize that the kitharoidic poets are equally implicated (147); see further below. For the shields here, Zielinski (1885), 267 n. 2; Weil/Reinach (1900), 122; Düring (1945), 185; Borthwick (1968), 62 ff.; Restani (1982), 150 f.; Barker (1984–9), 1.236 f.; Zimmermann (1993), 40; Dobrov/Urios-Aparisi (1995), 153. While several Aristophanic puns make Kinesias' *purhikhê* a 'crappy dance' (Bliquez [2008]), the joke may still be grounded in some real affair: see *Ran.* 152 f. with scholiast (and Dover ad loc.); Diom. *Art. Gramm.* III (1.475.9–25 Keil); *Suda* s.v. πυρρίχη; Lawler (1950), Borthwick (1968), 63–6; Ceccarelli (1998), 42–5; cf. Ceccarelli (1995), 293 ff. For the possible relevance of Ar. *Nub.* 987–9, see below.

⁸⁶ For the last point, see the comments of Kassel/Austin ad loc.

⁸⁷ Cf. Franklin (2002a), 688.

⁸⁸ *Aulos* in early Classical *paideia*: Wallace (2003); Martin (2003). Phrynis as aulete: Σ Ar. *Nub.* 971a; *Suda* s.v. Φρύνις.

⁸⁹ For melodic roads and junctions in Ion and Aristoxenos, see West (1992b), 25 f.; (1992a), 227 n. 25. Compare also βαδίζειν here with βαδίζουση μόνη in Pherecr. *PCG* 155.24, describing the state of Music which invites the modulatory assault of Timotheos. For the Aristophanic passages considered here, see also the discussion in Zimmermann (1992), 124; (1993); Dobrov/Urios-Aparisi (1995), 167 f.

⁹⁰ Cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1962), 41; Barker (1984–9), 1.93.

⁹¹ For this interpretation, surely correct, of ἐναρμόνια μέλη, see Barker (1984–9), 1.93 n. 21; an emendation to ἐν μίᾳ ἁρμονίᾳ (Chabanon) is unnecessary.

⁹² *IG* ii² 3028; Ar. *Av.* 1403 f.; Pl. *Gorg.* 501e. For the disjunction between comic smear and popular reality, see further Ieranò, this volume.

⁹³ Pi. *Pyth.* 3.113 f.; Aesch. fr. 314 (Nauck); Ar. *Nub.* 332 with Σ ad loc.; Pl. *Ion* 532d, *Prot.* 316d, *Resp.* 331e; Ath. 632c; Max. Tyr. 24.9; Hesych. s.v. Λασίσματα.

⁹⁴ Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 19 (194.5–196.7 Roberts): 'It is not possible for those writing melodies to alter the *melos* of strophes and antistrophes; rather, whether they commit themselves to enharmonic, chromatic, or diatonic melodies, they must safeguard these same melodic motions in all the strophes and antistrophes . . . But the dithyrambic poets even changed species (*tropoi*), making them Dorian and Phrygian and Lydian within the same song, and they altered the melodies too by making them now enharmonic, now chromatic, now diatonic . . . At least [sc. this was the approach of] musicians in the style of Philoxenos, Timotheos, and Telestes; for the older musicians, even the dithyramb was orderly'.

⁹⁵ For the fourth century at least we have good evidence for musicological lectures: *P.Hib.* 13 (by the dating of Brancacci [1988]); Theophr. *Char.* 5.10; Aristox. *Harm.* 31.

See also Wallace (1995). Even if Damon did not address the Areopagus (Wallace [1991]), Stratonikus, who made his living as a touring professional and styled himself the educator of the musically ignorant of Greece (Ath. 350e), is likely to have spoken his mind in favour of the New Music.

⁹⁶ Pl. *Leg.* 659b–c: [The *dêmos*] has corrupted the poets themselves, since they compose for the pleasure of their judges [i.e. the audience], which is a mean standard, so that in effect the spectators themselves teach the poets'. An anonymous reader notes Plato's similar point about politicians at *Gorg.* 512e–513c.

⁹⁷ Pl. *Leg.* 700e–701a.

⁹⁸ For Diagoras, Σ Ar. Av. 1071; Lys. 6.17; further references and discussion in Woodbury (1965); Dunbar (1995), 581–3. Kinesias: Lys. fr. 53 Thalheim (ap. Ath. 551ef). See also Ieranò in this volume.

⁹⁹ Reading Διαγόρας rather than δι ἀγορᾶς at *Ran.* 320 seems, to Dover (1993) ad loc., 'a poor joke and theatrically pointless', given the exalted tone of the mystic choros and the freshness of Diagoras' atheism. But given the potential complexity of Aristophanic humor, one might still hope that we have not yet fully fathomed the reference. Given the circumstantial historical evidence, the clear allusion to Kinesias in 365 (reprising 153) is certainly striking, and one might suppose the notorious affair of defecating on the *hekataia* (for which now Bliquez [2008]) equally unsuitable for the initiates' song — were this not comedy.

¹⁰⁰ For the continued religiosity of the 'new dithyramb', see Zimmerman (1992), 118–21; Csapo and the papers by Ieranò and Ford in this volume.

¹⁰¹ *Suda* s.v. κυκλίων τε χορῶν. 'Cosmic' dithyramb: Lawler (1960). Dithyrambists and sophists: Ford in this volume.

¹⁰² For the varying approaches taken by Plato and Aristotle to the mimetic nature and classification of dithyramb, see in this volume Peponi, Calame.

¹⁰³ For the later tendency to retroject innovations onto Lasos, cf. Privitera (1965), 76–8, 82, and for the biographical and critical works of the later fourth century, 51–85; cf. D'Angour (1997), 339; Porter (2007), 20.

¹⁰⁴ For the 'Kleisthenic moment' and the arrival of Lasos in Athens, cf. Zimmermann (1992), 35–8; Wilson (2000), 12–21.

¹⁰⁵ For the foreign provenance of many dithyrambists, see Wilson (1999) passim, and Ieranò in this volume with further references.

¹⁰⁶ See also Power in this volume.

¹⁰⁷ 103 See above, n. 4/000 – THIS ONE WAS COMPLETELY OUT OF SEQUENCE. IS IT PLACED CORRECTLY NOW?

¹⁰⁸ For Pratinas, see above n. 17/000.